arXiv:1704.03965v1 [math.AT] 13 Apr 2017

A DISTANCE BETWEEN FILTERED SPACES VIA TRIPODS

FACUNDO MÉMOLI

Abstract. We present a simplified treatment of stability of filtrations on finite spaces. Interestingly, we can lift the stability result for combinatorial filtrations from [CSEM06] to the case when two filtrations live on different spaces without directly invoking the concept of interleaving.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Simplicial Homology 1
3. Filtrations and Persistent Homology 2
4. Stability of filtrations 3
4.1. Filtrations defined over different sets 3
4.1.1. Common parametrizations of two spaces: tripods. 4
5. Filtrations arising from metric spaces: Rips and Čech 5
5.1. The Rips filtration 5
5.2. The Čech filtration 6
6. Discussion 7
References 7

1. Introduction

My goal for the construction that I describe in this note was to lift the stability result of [CSEM06] to the setting when the simplicial filtrations are not necessarily defined on the same set. The ideas in this note were first presented at ATCMS in July 2012. A partial discussion appears in [Ban12].

2. Simplicial Homology

Given a simplicial complex L and simplices $\sigma, \tau \in L$, we write $\sigma \subseteq \tau$ whenever σ is a face of τ. For each integer $\ell \geq 0$ we denote by $L^{(\ell)}$ the ℓ-skeleton of L.

Recall that given two finite simplicial complexes L and S, a *simplicial map* between them arises from any map $f : L^{(0)} \to S^{(0)}$ with the property that whenever $p_0, p_1, \ldots, p_k$ span a simplex in L, then $f(p_0), f(p_1), \ldots, f(p_k)$ span a simplex of S. One does not require that the vertices $f(p_0), f(p_1), \ldots, f(p_k)$ be all distinct. Given a map $f : L^{(0)} \to S^{(0)}$ between the vertex sets of the finite simplicial complexes L and S, we let $\overline{f} : L \to S$ denote the induced *simplicial map*.

Date: April 14, 2017.
This work was supported by NSF grants IIS-1422400 and CCF-1526513.

We will make use of the following theorem in the sequel.

Theorem 2.1 (Quillen's Theorem A in the simplicial category, [Qui73])**.** *Let $\zeta : S \to L$ be a simplicial map between two finite complexes. Suppose that the preimage of each closed simplex of L is contractible. Then ζ is a homotopy equivalence.*

Corollary 2.1. *Let L be a finite simplicial complex and $\varphi : Z \to L^{(0)}$ be any surjective map with finite domain Z. Let $S := \{\tau \subseteq Z | \, \varphi(\tau) \in L\}$. Then S is a simplicial complex and the induced simplicial map $\overline{\varphi} : S \to L$ is an homotopy equivalence.*

Proof. Note that $S = \bigcup_{\sigma \in L} \{\tau \subseteq Z | \, \varphi(\tau) = \sigma\}$ so it is clear that S is a simplicial complex with vertex set Z. That the preimage of each $\sigma \in L$ is contractible is trivially true since those preimages are exactly the simplices in S. The conclusion follows directly from Quillen's Theorem A. □

In this paper we consider homology with coefficients in a field $\mathbb{F}$ so that given a simplicial complex L, then for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $H_k(L, \mathbb{F})$ is a vector space. To simplify notation, we drop the argument $\mathbb{F}$ from the list and only write $H_k(L)$ for the homology of L with coefficients in $\mathbb{F}$.

3. Filtrations and Persistent Homology

Let $\mathcal{F}$ denote the set of all finite *filtered spaces*: that is pairs $\mathbf{X} = (X, F_X)$ where X is a finite set and $F_X : \mathrm{pow}(X) \to \mathbb{R}$ is a monotone function. Any such function is called a *filtration* over X. Monotonicity in this context refers to the condition that $F_X(\sigma) \geq F_X(\tau)$ whenever $\sigma \supseteq \tau$. Given a finite set X, by $\mathcal{F}(X)$ we denote the set of all possible filtrations $F_X : \mathrm{pow}(X) \to \mathbb{R}$ on X. Given a filtered space $\mathbf{X} = (X, F_X) \in \mathcal{F}$, for each $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$ define the simplicial complex

$$L_\varepsilon(\mathbf{X}) := \big\{\sigma \subseteq X | \, F_X(\sigma) \leq \varepsilon\big\}.$$

One then considers the nested family of simplicial complexes

$$L(\mathbf{X}) := \big\{L_\varepsilon(\mathbf{X}) \subset L_{\varepsilon'}(\mathbf{X})\big\}_{\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon'}$$

where each $L_\varepsilon(\mathbf{X})$ is, by construction, finite. At the level of homology, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ the above inclusions give rise to a system of vector spaces and linear maps

$$\mathbb{V}_k(\mathbf{X}) := \big\{V_\varepsilon(\mathbf{X}) \xrightarrow{v_{\varepsilon,\varepsilon'}} V_{\varepsilon'}(\mathbf{X})\big\}_{\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon'},$$

which is called a *persistence vector space.* Note that each $V_\varepsilon(\mathbf{X})$ is finite dimensional.

Persistence vector spaces admit a *classification up to isomorphism* in terms of collections of intervals so that to the persistence vector space $\mathbb{V}$ one assigns a multiset of intervals $I(\mathbb{V})$ [CDS10]. These collections of intervals are sometimes referred to as *barcodes* or also *persistence diagrams*, depending on the graphical representation that is adopted [EH10]. We denote by $\mathcal{D}$ the collection of all finite persistence diagrams. An element $D \in \mathcal{D}$ is a *finite* multiset of points

$$D = \{(b_\alpha, d_\alpha),\, 0 \leq b_\alpha \leq d_\alpha,\, \alpha \in A\}$$

for some (finite) index set A. Given $k \in \mathbb{N}$, to any filtered set $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{F}$ one can attach a persistence diagram via

$$\mathbf{X} \longmapsto L(\mathbf{X}) \longmapsto \mathbb{V}_k(\mathbf{X}) \longmapsto I\big(\mathbb{V}_k(\mathbf{X})\big).$$

We denote by $\mathrm{D}_k : \mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{D}$ the resulting composite map. Given $\mathbf{X} = (X, F_X)$, we will sometimes write $\mathrm{D}_k(F_X)$ to denote $\mathrm{D}_k(\mathbf{X})$.

4. Stability of filtrations

The *bottleneck distance* is a useful notion of distance between persistence diagrams and we recall it's definition next. We will follow the presentation on [Car14]. Let $\Delta \subset \mathbb{R}^2_+$ be comprised of those points which sit above the diagonal: $\Delta := \{(x, y) |\, x \leq y\}$.

Define the *persistence* of a point $P = (x_P, y_P) \in \Delta$ by $\mathrm{pers}(P) := y_P - x_P$.

Let $D_1 = \{P_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A_1}$ and $D_2 = \{Q_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A_2}$ be two persistence diagrams indexed over the finite index sets A_1 and A_2, respectively. Consider subsets $B_i \subseteq A_i$ with $|B_1| = |B_2|$ and any bijection $\varphi : B_1 \to B_2$, then define

$$J(\varphi) := \max\left(\max_{\beta \in B_1} \|P_\beta - Q_{\varphi(\beta)}\|_\infty, \max_{\alpha \in A_1 \setminus B_1} \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{pers}(P_\alpha), \max_{\alpha \in A_2 \setminus B_2} \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{pers}(P_\alpha)\right).$$

Finally, one defines the bottleneck distance between D_1 and D_2 by

$$d_{\mathcal{D}}(D_1, D_2) := \min_{(B_1, B_2, \varphi)} J(\varphi),$$

where (B_1, B_2, φ) ranges over all $B_1 \subset A_1$, $B_2 \subset A_2$, and bijections $\varphi : B_1 \to B_2$.

One of the standard results about the stability of persistent homology invariants, which is formulated in terms of the Bottleneck distance, is the proposition below which we state in a weaker form that will suffice for our presentation:[1]

Theorem 4.1 ([CSEM06])**.** *For all finite sets X and filtrations $F, G : \mathrm{pow}(X) \to \mathbb{R}$,*

$$d_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathrm{D}_k(F), \mathrm{D}_k(G)) \leq \max_{\sigma \in \mathrm{pow}(X)} |F(\sigma) - G(\sigma)|,$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

The proof of this theorem offered in [CSEM06] is purely combinatorial and elementary. This result requires that the two filtrations be given on the *same* set. This restriction will be lifted using the ideas that follow.

4.1. Filtrations defined over different sets.

A *parametrization* of a finite set X is any finite set Z and a surjective map $\varphi_X : Z \to X$. Consider a filtered space $\mathbf{X} = (X, F_X) \in \mathcal{F}$ and a parametrization $\varphi_X : Z \to X$ of X. By $\varphi_X^* F_X$ we denote the *pullback filtration* induced by F_X and the map φ_X on Z. This filtration is given by $\tau \mapsto F_X(\varphi_X(\tau))$ for all $\tau \in \mathrm{pow}(Z)$.

A useful corollary of the persistence homology isomorphism theorem [EH10, pp. 139] and Corollary 2.1 is that the persistence diagrams of the original filtration and the pullback filtration are identical.

Corollary 4.1. *Let $\mathbf{X} = (X, F_X) \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\varphi : Z \twoheadrightarrow X$ a parametrization of X. Then, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathrm{D}_k(\varphi^* F_X) = \mathrm{D}_k(F_X)$.*

[1] In [CSEM06] the authors do not assume that the underlying simplicial complex is the full powerset.

4.1.1. *Common parametrizations of two spaces: tripods.* Now, given $\mathbf{X} = (X, F_X)$ and $\mathbf{Y} = (Y, F_Y)$ in $\mathcal{F}$, the main idea in comparing filtrations defined on different spaces is to consider parametrizations $\varphi_X : Z \twoheadrightarrow X$ and $\varphi_Y : Z \twoheadrightarrow Y$ of X and Y from a *common* parameter space Z, i.e. *tripods*:



and compare the pullback filtrations $\varphi_X^* F_X$ and $\varphi_Y^* F_Y$ on Z. Formally, define

$$(1)\quad d_{\mathcal{F}}\big(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}\big) := \inf\left\{ \max_{\tau \in \mathrm{pow}(Z)} \big|\varphi_X^* F_X(\tau) - \varphi_Y^* F_Y(\tau)\big|;\ \varphi_X : Z \twoheadrightarrow X,\ \varphi_Y : Z \twoheadrightarrow Y \text{ parametrizations} \right\}.$$

Remark 4.1. Notice that in case $X = \{*\}$ and $F_{\{*\}}(*) = c \in \mathbb{R}$, then $d_{\mathcal{F}}(X, Y) = \max_{\sigma \subset Y} \big|F_Y(\sigma) - c\big|$, for any filtered space Y. If $c = 0$, $Y = \{y_1, y_2\}$ with $F_Y(y_1) = F_Y(y_2) = 0$ and $F_Y(\{y_1, y_2\}) = 1$. Then, $d_{\mathcal{F}}(X, Y) = 1$.

However, still with $c = 0$ and $Y = \{y_1, y_2\}$, but $F_Y(y_1) = F_Y(y_2) = F_Y(\{y_1, y_2\}) = 0$, one has $d_{\mathcal{F}}(X, Y) = 0$. This means that $d_{\mathcal{F}}$ is at best a pseudometric on filtered spaces.

Proposition 4.1. *$d_{\mathcal{F}}$ is a pseudometric on $\mathcal{F}$.*

Proof. Symmetry and non-negativity are clear. We need to prove the triangle inequality. Let $\mathbf{X} = (X, F_X)$, $\mathbf{Y} = (Y, F_Y)$, and $\mathbf{W} = (W, F_W)$ in $\mathcal{F}$ be non-empty and $\eta_1, \eta_2 > 0$ be s.t.

$$d_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) < \eta_1 \text{ and } d_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{W}) < \eta_2.$$

Choose, $\psi_X : Z_1 \twoheadrightarrow X$, $\psi_Y : Z_1 \twoheadrightarrow Y$, $\zeta_Y : Z_2 \twoheadrightarrow Y$, and $\zeta_W : Z_2 \twoheadrightarrow W$ surjective such that

$$\|F_X \circ \psi_X - F_Y \circ \psi_Y\|_{\ell^\infty(\mathrm{pow}(Z_1))} < \eta_1$$

and

$$\|F_Y \circ \zeta_Y - F_W \circ \zeta_W\|_{\ell^\infty(\mathrm{pow}(Z_2))} < \eta_2.$$

Let $Z \subseteq Z_1 \times Z_2$ be defined by $Z := \{(z_1, z_2) \in Z_1 \times Z_2 | \psi_Y(z_1) = \zeta_Y(z_2)\}$ and consider the following (pullback) diagram:



Clearly, since ψ_Y and ζ_Y are surjective, Z is non-empty. Now, consider the following three maps with domain Z: $\phi_X := \psi_X \circ \pi_1$, $\phi_Y := \psi_Y \circ \pi_1 = \zeta_Y \circ \pi_2$, and $\phi_W := \zeta_W \circ \pi_2$. These three

maps are surjective and therefore constitute parametrizations of X, Y, and W, respectively. Then, since $\pi_i : Z \to Z_i$, $i = 1, 2$, are surjective and $\psi_Y \circ \pi_1 = \zeta_Y \circ \pi_2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{W}) &\leq \|F_X \circ \phi_X - F_W \circ \phi_W\|_{\ell^\infty(\mathrm{pow}(Z))} \\ &\leq \|F_X \circ \phi_X - F_Y \circ \phi_Y\|_{\ell^\infty(\mathrm{pow}(Z))} + \|F_Y \circ \phi_Y - F_W \circ \phi_W\|_{\ell^\infty(\mathrm{pow}(Z))} \\ &= \|F_X \circ \psi_X - F_Y \circ \psi_Y\|_{\ell^\infty(\mathrm{pow}(Z_1))} + \|F_Y \circ \zeta_Y - F_W \circ \zeta_W\|_{\ell^\infty(\mathrm{pow}(Z_2))} \\ &\leq \eta_1 + \eta_2. \end{aligned}$$

The conclusion follows by letting $\eta_1 \searrow d_{\mathcal{F}}(X, Y)$ and $\eta_2 \searrow d_{\mathcal{F}}(Y, W)$. □

We now obtain a lifted version of Theorem 4.1

Theorem 4.2. *For all finite filtered spaces $\mathbf{X} = (X, F_X)$ and $\mathbf{Y} = (Y, F_Y)$, and all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ one has:*

$$d_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathrm{D}_k(\mathbf{X}), \mathrm{D}_k(\mathbf{Y})) \leq d_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}).$$

Proof of Theorem 4.2. Assume $\varepsilon > 0$ is such that $d_{\mathcal{F}}(F_X, F_Y) < \varepsilon$. Then, let $\varphi_X : Z \to X$ and $\varphi_Y : Z \to Y$ be surjective maps from the finite set Z into X and Y, respectively, such that $|\varphi_X^* F_X(\tau) - \varphi_Y^* F_Y(\tau)| < \varepsilon$ for all $\tau \in \mathrm{pow}(Z)$. Then, by Theorem 4.1,

$$d_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathrm{D}_k(\varphi_X^* F_X), \mathrm{D}_k(\varphi_Y^* F_Y)) < \varepsilon.$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Now apply Corollary 4.1 and conclude by letting ε approach $d_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$. □

5. Filtrations arising from metric spaces: Rips and Čech

Recall [BBI01] that for two compact metric spaces (X, d_X) and (Y, d_Y), a correspondence between them is amy subset R of $X \times Y$ such that the natural projections $\pi_X : X \times Y \to X$ and $\pi_Y : X \times Y \to Y$ are such that $\pi_X(R) = X$ and $\pi_Y(R) = Y$. The distortion of any such correspondence is given by

$$\mathrm{dis}(R) := \sup_{(x,y),(x',y') \in R} \left| d_X(x, x') - d_Y(y, y') \right|.$$

Then, Gromov-Hausdorff distance between (X, d_X) and (Y, d_Y) is defined as

$$d_{\mathcal{GH}}(X, Y) := \frac{1}{2} \inf_R \mathrm{dis}(R),$$

where the infimum is taken over all correspondences R between X and Y.

5.1. **The Rips filtration.** Recall the definition of the *Rips filtration* of a finite metric space (X, d_X): for $\sigma \in \mathrm{pow}(X)$,

$$F_X^{\mathrm{R}}(\sigma) = \mathbf{diam}_X(\sigma) := \max_{x,x' \in X} d_X(x, x').$$

The following theorem was first proved in [CCSG$^+$09]. A different proof (also applicable to compact metric spaces) relying on the interleaving distance and multivalued maps was given in [CDSO14]. Yet another different proof avoiding multivalued maps is given in [CM16].

Theorem 5.1. *For all finite metric spaces X and Y, and all $k \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$d_{\mathcal{D}}\big(\mathrm{D}_k(F_X^{\mathrm{R}}), \mathrm{D}_k(F_Y^{\mathrm{R}})\big) \leq 2\, d_{\mathcal{GH}}(X, Y).$$

A different proof of Theorem 5.1 can be obtained by combining Theorem 4.2 and Proposition 5.1 below.

Proposition 5.1. *For all finite metric spaces X and Y,*

$$d_{\mathcal{F}}\big(F_X^{\mathrm{R}}, F_Y^{\mathrm{R}}\big) \leq 2\, d_{\mathcal{GH}}(X,Y).$$

Proof of Proposition 5.1. Let X and Y be s.t. $d_{\mathcal{GH}}(X,Y) < \eta$, and let $R \subset X \times Y$ be a surjective relation with $|d_X(x,x') - d_Y(y,y')| \leq 2\eta$ for all $(x,y),(x',y') \in R$. Consider the parametrization $Z = R$, and $\varphi_X = \pi_1 : Z \to X$ and $\varphi_Y = \pi_2 : Z \to Y$, then

$$|d_X(\varphi_X(t),\varphi_X(t')) - d_Y(\varphi_Y(t),\varphi_Y(t'))| \leq 2\eta \tag{2}$$

for all $t, t' \in Z$. Pick any $\tau \in Z$ and notice that

$$\varphi_X^* F_X^{\mathrm{R}}(\tau) = F_X^{\mathrm{R}}(\varphi_X(\tau)) = \max_{t,t' \in \tau} d_X(\varphi_X(t),\varphi_X(t')).$$

Now, similarly, write

$$\varphi_Y^* F_Y^{\mathrm{R}}(\tau) = \max_{t,t' \in \tau} d_Y(\varphi_Y(t),\varphi_Y(t')) \leq \max_{t,t' \in \tau} d_X(\varphi_X(t),\varphi_X(t')) + 2\eta = \varphi_X^* F_X^{\mathrm{R}}(\tau) + 2\eta, \tag{3}$$

where the last inequality follows from (2). The proof follows by interchanging the roles of X and Y. □

5.2. **The Čech filtration.** Another interesting and frequently used filtration is the *Čech filtration*: for each $\sigma \in \mathrm{pow}(X)$,

$$F_X^{\mathrm{C}}(\sigma) := \mathbf{rad}_X(\sigma) = \min_{p \in X} \max_{x \in \sigma} d_X(x,p).$$

That is, the filtration value of each simplex corresponds to its *circumradius*.

Proposition 5.2. *For all finite metric spaces X and Y,*

$$d_{\mathcal{F}}\big(F_X^{W}, F_Y^{W}\big) \leq 2\, d_{\mathcal{GH}}(X,Y).$$

Again, as a corollary of Theorem 4.2 and Proposition 5.2 we have the following

Theorem 5.2. *For all finite metric spaces X and Y, and all $k \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$d_{\mathcal{D}}\big(\mathrm{D}_k(F_X^{\mathrm{C}}), \mathrm{D}_k(F_Y^{\mathrm{C}})\big) \leq 2\, d_{\mathcal{GH}}(X,Y).$$

A proof of this theorem via the interleaving distance and multi-valued maps has appeared in [CDSO14].[2] Another proof avoiding multivalued maps is given in [CM16].

Proof of Proposition 5.2. The proof is similar to that of Proposition 5.1. Pick any $\tau \in Z$, then,

$$\varphi_X^* F_X^{W}(\tau) = F_X^{W}(\varphi_X(\tau)) = \min_{p \in X} \max_{t \in \tau} d_X(p,\varphi_X(t)) = \max_{t \in \tau} d_X(p_\tau,\varphi_X(t))$$

for some $p_\tau \in X$. Let $t_\tau \in Z$ be s.t. $\varphi_X(t_\tau) = p_\tau$, and from the above obtain

$$\varphi_X^* F_X^{W}(\tau) = \max_{t \in \tau} d_X(\varphi_X(t_\tau),\varphi_X(t)).$$

[2]The version in [CDSO14] applies to compact metric spaces.

Now, similarly, write

(4)
$$\varphi_Y^* F_Y^W(\tau) = \min_{q\in Y}\max_{t\in\tau} d_Y(q,\varphi_Y(t)) \leq \max_{t\in\tau} d_Y(\varphi_Y(t_\tau),\varphi_Y(t)) \leq \max_{t\in\tau} d_X(\varphi_X(t_\tau),\varphi_X(t)) + 2\eta$$
$$= \varphi_X^* F_X^W(\tau) + 2\eta,$$

where the last inequality follows from (2). The proof follows by interchanging the roles of X and Y. □

6. Discussion

It seems possible to extend some of these ideas to the case of not necessarily finite filtered spaces.

References

[Ban12] BIRS station. Banff. http://www.birs.ca/events/2012/5-day-workshops/12w5081/videos/watch/2012101 2012.

[BBI01] D. Burago, Y. Burago, and S. Ivanov. *A Course in Metric Geometry*, volume 33 of *AMS Graduate Studies in Math.* American Mathematical Society, 2001.

[Car14] Gunnar Carlsson. Topological pattern recognition for point cloud data. *Acta Numerica*, 23:289368, 2014.

[CCSG+09] F. Chazal, D. Cohen-Steiner, L. Guibas, F. Mémoli, and S. Oudot. Gromov-Hausdorff stable signatures for shapes using persistence. In *Proc. of SGP*, 2009.

[CDS10] Gunnar Carlsson and Vin De Silva. Zigzag persistence. *Foundations of computational mathematics*, 10(4):367–405, 2010.

[CDSO14] Frédéric Chazal, Vin De Silva, and Steve Oudot. Persistence stability for geometric complexes. *Geometriae Dedicata*, 173(1):193–214, 2014.

[CM16] Samir Chowdhury and Facundo Mémoli. Persistent homology of asymmetric networks: An approach based on dowker filtrations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.05432*, 2016.

[CSEM06] David Cohen-Steiner, Herbert Edelsbrunner, and Dmitriy Morozov. Vines and vineyards by updating persistence in linear time. In *SCG '06: Proceedings of the twenty-second annual symposium on Computational geometry*, pages 119–126, New York, NY, USA, 2006. ACM.

[EH10] Herbert Edelsbrunner and John Harer. *Computational Topology - an Introduction*. American Mathematical Society, 2010.

[Qui73] Daniel Quillen. Higher algebraic k-theory: I. In *Higher K-theories*, pages 85–147. Springer, 1973.

E-mail address: memoli@math.osu.edu

(F. Mémoli) Department of Mathematics and Department of Computer Science and Engineering, The Ohio State University. Phone: (614) 292-4975, Fax: (614) 292-1479.